

REMARKS

The Applicants hereby submit the present Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b) for the above-referenced patent application, entry of which is earnestly solicited. Claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 15, and 16 have been amended; claims 3, 6, 11, 14, and 23 have been canceled. The Applicants also add new claims 31-42. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been entered from the amendment of claims and addition of new claims.

In the Office Action mailed on 21 March 2005, the Examiner indicated that claims 17-22 and 24-30 were allowed. The Applicants respectfully acknowledge such allowability over the prior art of record.

In addition, the Examiner indicated that claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 12, and 13 were directed to allowable subject matter, and merely objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's conditional allowability of these claims. In response, the Applicant adds new claims 31-42 which are directed to and include all limitations of such allowable claims. In particular, new claims 31-33 correspond to indicated allowable claims 4, 5, and 2, respectfully; new claims 34-36 correspond to indicated allowable claims 12, 13, and 10, respectfully; new claims 37-39 correspond to indicated allowable claims 5, 4, and 2, respectfully; and new claims 40-42 correspond to indicated allowable claims 13, 12, and 10, respectfully. As apparent, no new issues are presented by the addition of these new claims.

In the same Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 6, 7, 11, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In a related rejection, the Examiner objected to the specification under 37 C.F.R. § 1.71 and 1.75(d)(1) as failing to provide proper

antecedent basis. These arguments relate to use of the term "second pedestal" provided in the previous amendment by the Applicants.

In response, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's response in the Office Action. The Applicants submit that there is indeed support for the "pedestal" in the specification as originally filed. Exemplary support for the added limitations may be found at FIG. 10 with components 1014 and 1016; page 10, page 12 at lines 19-22 through page 13 at lines 1-4; and original claims 7-8, 15-16, and 24-25. Pole piece 1016 of FIG. 10 clearly is a pedestal, and the claims clearly define that which is shown in FIG. 10 as an example. Even if the term "pedestal" is not explicitly recited in relation to reference 1016, pole piece 1016 clearly is a pedestal. On-line dictionary resources define "pedestal" as (1) an architectural support or base, as for a column or statue; (2) a support or foundation. Clearly, pole piece 1016 falls into such a basic definition.

In this paper, the Applicants amend independent claims 1 and 9 to include all limitations of previous dependent claims 3 and 11, respectively, which include all of the same "pedestal" type limitations. Despite the support indicated above, however, the Applicants recite the term "pole piece" in lieu of the term "pedestal" to avoid any perceived ambiguity by the Examiner. Since the prior art of record failed to teach or suggest the limitations of earlier dependent claims 3, 6, 7, 11, 14, and 15 for any rejection under Sections 102 and 103, as apparent from the lack of any 102/103 rejections given by the Examiner, claims 1-16 as amended are now allowable over the prior art of record.

Finally, the Applicants respectfully submit that one ordinarily skilled in the art may appreciate the further limitations of dependent claims for novelty and non-obviousness, but need not elaborate on such at the present time due to the indicated allowability of the independent claims.

Based on the above, the Applicants submit that all pending claims are allowable over the prior art of record and that the present application is now in a condition suitable for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request entry of the Amendment and allowance of the application.

Thank you. Please feel free to contact the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

9 Dec 2005

JOHN J. OSKOREP
Reg. No. 41,234

JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ.
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER
980 N. MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611

Telephone: (312) 222-1860 Fax: (312) 214-6303